



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.				
10/802,141	03/17/2004	Nagesh Sonti	215P011709-US (PAR)	3267				
2512 PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824	7590 03/18/2008		<table border="1"><tr><td>EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td>KESSLER, CHRISTOPHER S</td></tr></table>		EXAMINER	KESSLER, CHRISTOPHER S		
EXAMINER								
KESSLER, CHRISTOPHER S								
			<table border="1"><tr><td>ART UNIT</td><td>PAPER NUMBER</td></tr><tr><td>1793</td><td></td></tr></table>	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	1793		
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER							
1793								
			<table border="1"><tr><td>MAIL DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td>03/18/2008</td><td>PAPER</td></tr></table>	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	03/18/2008	PAPER	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE							
03/18/2008	PAPER							

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/802,141

Applicant(s)

SONTI ET AL.

Examiner

CHRISTOPHER KESSLER

Art Unit

1793

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) CHRISTOPHER KESSLER.(3) Dr Nagesh Sonti.

(2) _____.

(4) Mr Bill Knotts.

Date of Interview: 27 February 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Dr. Sonti described test results from gears fabricated with the instant invention in comparison to conventional gears.

Claim(s) discussed: 19 and 35.

Identification of prior art discussed: Amateau.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed the differences between the prior art process and the process of the instant invention. Applicant argues that the mechanical property data should be included as unexpected results. The Examiner noted that any evidence showing unexpected results should compare the invention to the closest prior art. The Examiner suggested ways that the claims might be amended to distinguish over the prior art process.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Christopher Kessler/
Examiner, Art Unit 1793

Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
Attachment to a signed Office action.